

Appl. No. : 09/943,483  
Filed : August 29, 2001

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 26, 2004, the Examiner objected to various informal errors in the claims. The Examiner rejected claims 7-13, 15-21, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry (U.S. Patent No. 1,355,669) in view of Neal (U.S. Patent No. 5,779,317). The Examiner also rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Neal and in further view of Frobose (U.S. Patent No. 4,566,735) or Lissner (U.S. Patent No. 4,747,011). The Examiner also rejected claims 7-13, 15-21, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzgerald (U.S. Patent No. 1,847,605) in view of Neal and Taylor (U.S. Patent No. 4,884,353). By this paper, Applicant addresses each of the foregoing actions issued by the Examiner.

#### Objections to Informalities

Each of the informal errors noted by the Examiner has been either corrected or addressed by the amendment in response to the obviousness rejection.

#### Rejection of Independent Claims 7 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant has amended claim 7 to recite the main body comprising a panel. Applicant further includes limitations where the at least one first retainer *extends from* the first edge of the main body, and the at least one second retainer *extends from* the second edge of the main body. Applicant further includes a limitation that each of the at least one first retainer and the at least one second retainer has a hook shape that is biased towards the rear surface of the main body. Applicant further includes a limitation that the at least one first retainer and the at least one second retainer are interconnected by the panel of the main body. Applicant has amended claim 15 in a similar manner.

Applicant believes that none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed device as recited in claims 7 and 15. Applicant further notes that the Federal Circuit has stated that “obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching suggestion or incentive supporting the combination.” In re Geiger, 815 F.2d 686, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended form of claims 7 and 15 are patentable over the cited references.

Appl. No. : 09/943,483  
Filed : August 29, 2001

Rejection of Dependent Claims

The rejected dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims (7 and 15), plus additional limitations. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejected dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Cancellation of Dependent Claims 10 and 11

Applicant notes that limitations addressed by dependent claims 10 and 11 have been incorporated into claim 7. Thus, claims 10 and 11 have been canceled.

Summary

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that this Application is now in a condition ready for allowance and respectfully requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

2/24/05

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Michael H. Trenholm  
Registration No. 37,743  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231